

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 LEGALZOOM.COM, INC.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ROCKET LAWYER, INC.,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C15-0265JLR

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
COMPEL

15 Before the court is Plaintiff LegalZoom.com, Inc.’s (“LegalZoom”) motion to  
16 compel the production of documents by and deposition of non-party Michael Margolis.  
17 (*See* Mot. (Dkt. # 1).) LegalZoom seeks documents pertaining to a project that Mr.  
18 Margolis worked on as an employee of Google Ventures, a subsidiary of Google, Inc.  
19 (“Google”). (Veltman Decl. (Dkt. # 7) ¶ 3.) LegalZoom recently filed a similar motion  
20 to compel against Google in the Northern District of California (“Northern District”).  
21 (*See* 3/25/15 Letter (Dkt. # 14)); *see also LegalZoom.com v. Rocket Lawyer, Inc.*, No.  
22 5:15-mc-80003-NC (N.D. Cal.) Dkt. # 1. The subpoena to Google at issue in that motion

1 is virtually identical to the subpoena to Mr. Margolis at issue in this motion. (*Compare*  
2 Margolis Sub. (Dkt. # 7-1) with Google Sub. (Dkt. # 7-2).) On March 23, 2015,  
3 Magistrate Judge Cousins denied LegalZoom's motion to compel in the Northern  
4 District. *See LegalZoom.com v. Rocket Lawyer, Inc.*, No. 5:15-mc-80003-NC (N.D. Cal.)  
5 Dkt. # 10.

6 This court stayed the case pending adjudication of LegalZoom's motion for relief  
7 from Judge Cousins' order. (*See* 4/7/15 Order (Dkt. # 15).) On April 15, 2015, Judge  
8 Koh denied LegalZoom's motion. *See LegalZoom.com v. Rocket Lawyer, Inc.*, No. 5:15-  
9 mc-80003-NC (N.D. Cal.) Dkt. # 15 (finding that "there is no support for [LegalZoom's]  
10 position in either the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or case law"); (*see also* 4/16/16  
11 Letter (Dkt. # 16) Ex. A.) Accordingly, the court LIFTS the stay in this matter.

12 Having examined the parties' submissions, the record, and the relevant law, the  
13 court finds that the reasoning of the Northern District is persuasive. The court  
14 independently adopts the Northern District's reasoning and incorporates it herein.  
15 Consistent with that reasoning, the court concludes that LegalZoom has not met its  
16 burden under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(d)(1) to take "reasonable steps to avoid  
17 imposing undue burden or expense" on non-party Mr. Margolis. *See LegalZoom.com v.*  
18 *Rocket Lawyer, Inc.*, No. 5:15-mc-80003-NC (N.D. Cal.) Dkt. # 10; Fed. R. Civ. P.  
19 45(d)(1).


20 //

21 //

22 //

1 Accordingly, the court DENIES LegalZoom's motion to compel (Dkt. # 1).

2 Dated this 17th day of April, 2015.

3  
4 

5 JAMES L. ROBART  
6 United States District Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22